

## **REMARKS**

The non-final Office Action dated March 6, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-8 have been amended and claims 9-16 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-16 are pending upon entry of the present amendment. Entry of the amendments and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

### ***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112***

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 3, thus rendering this rejection moot.

### ***Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Droms *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,143,435, “Droms”) in view of Lim *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,024, “Lim”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein modifying [] one or more protocol fields includes: upon receiving a DHCP message for request sent from [a] DHCP client to [a] DHCP server, filling in at least one field associated with the DHCP relay in the DHCP message for request, and upon receiving a DHCP message for response sent from the DHCP server to the DHCP client, replacing at least one server parameter of a field associated with the DHCP server in the DHCP message for response with at least one relay parameter of the DHCP relay.” Nowhere does either Droms or Lim, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest such features. The Action, however, asserts, at p. 4, that Droms discloses replacing DHCP server parameters associated with the DHCP server in a DHCP response message with DHCP relay parameters of the DHCP relay at Figures 2-5B. Applicants respectfully disagree. Figures 2-5B merely illustrate that a DHCP relay agent may send an inform message (received from a DHCP client) to the server with authentication and authorization data. Thus, even assuming, without conceding, that authentication and authorization data corresponds to DHCP relay parameters, Droms still lacks a teaching or suggestion of *replacing* server parameters *in a response message from a server* with the authentication and authorization data. In short, Applicants respectfully submit the Action’s assertions are not valid because 1) merely adding

data to a message does not constitute replacing data in the message with other data and 2) Droms description of adding authentication and authorization data is with respect to a message from a client, not a response message from a server. At best, Droms describes a relay agent stripping off a relay-agent information option prior to sending the message to the DHCP client without any mention of replacing data in the response message. Col. 12, ll. 44-49. Lim also does not teach or suggest the above noted features and thus fails to cure the deficiencies of Droms. Thus, notwithstanding whether the asserted combination of Droms and Lim is valid, the asserted combination would not have resulted in the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

### ***New Claims***

Claims 9-16 have been added. No new matter has been added. While claims 9-16 have not been rejected, Applicants provide the following remarks in the interest of expediting prosecution.

Claims 9 and 14 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1 and are thus allowable for substantially the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 10-13, 15 and 16 depend on claims 9 and 14 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

### CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 9, 2008

By: /Elizabeth A. Almeter/ Reg. No. 57019 for:  
Chunhsi Andy Mu  
Registration No. 58,216

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.  
1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001